

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,434	07/13/2001	Timothy B. Main	59159-9	3429
22504	7590 01/21/2004		EXAMINER	
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP			HYLTON, ROBIN A.	
	URY SQUARE TH AVENUE		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE,	WA 98101-1688		3727	
			DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004	23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/905,434	MAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robin A. Hylton	3727	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the same of the s	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application i	i in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension for the final Office action; or (2) as se	ee under et forth in
<ul><li>1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's</li><li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li></ul>	·	•	146
2. $\boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	en e	
(a) M they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	e'
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	pelow);		* *.
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplify	ing the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			13.5
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amer	ndment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT plac	e the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were new	·ly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			<b>1</b> . 3
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			•
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-5,7-11 and 20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12,14-16 a	<u>nnd 18</u> .		· .
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on 18 December 2003	g is a) □ approved or b) ⊠ dis	approved∕ђy the Ęxamine	г.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme  10. Other: See Continuation Sheet	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	ROBINA HALTON PRIMARY EXAMINER	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/905,434

Application No.



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 raises new issues with respect to the dependent claims since the limitation of a continuous perimeter surrounding the aperture was not required in the claimed structure of the bag. Additionally, the proposed amendments do not clearly place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Continuation of 10. Other: The proposed drawings are not approved since each figure must be separate entities.